

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The title of the invention and the abstract have been amended to comply with the instructions on the Office Action.

Claim 1 is amended.

Claims 11-21 are withdrawn and have been cancelled.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 is amended to include “a microwave generating device for generating the microwave of 5.8 GHz.” Thus, the rejection as it applies to claims 1-5 are moot.

Claims 1-4, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nobue (JP 2003-308962). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the amended claim 1, Nobue does not disclose a high frequency heating apparatus comprising a plurality of feeding ports for emitting the microwave and mounted to the wave guides. The Nobue’s device comprises only one feeding port 62 (Nobue; Figure 8). Therefore, since every limitation of claim is not taught by the reference, claim 1 is not fully

anticipated by Nobeu. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 which are dependent from claim 1 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 8 and 9 are dependent from claim 6. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 6 are included in claims 8 and 9. Regarding claims 8 and 9, Nobue does not disclose a wide range wave guide in a shape of a parallelepiped constituted by including a number of feeding ports is provided on a rear side of the heating chamber. As described above regarding claim 1, the Nobue's device comprises only one feeding port 62. Therefore, since every limitation of claims 8 and 9 is not taught by the reference, claims 8 and 9 are not fully anticipated by Nobeu. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 8 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-10 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nobue in view of Yamada (JP 2-244589) or Smith (US 3,210,511).

Regarding claim 3, none of Nobue, Yamada and Smith discloses, teaches, or renders obvious that the at least two pieces of wave guides are arranged at an upper wall of the cavity. In Nobue, two pieces of wave guides 67, 68 are located at the bottom of the heating cavity (Nobue; Figure 8). Yamada's microwave generating device comprises wave guides at the side of the device (Figures 1 and 2(a)), or only one wave guide at the ceiling of the device (Figure 2(b)). Smith's microwave oven comprises one waveguide at the ceiling of the oven and the other waveguide at the bottom of the oven. Accordingly, the combination of Nobue, Yamada and Smith does not meet all of the limitations of claim 3. Therefore, the asserted combination of Nobue,

Yamada and Smith does not render claim 3 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 5 which are dependent from claim 3 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 3.

Regarding claim 6, none of Nobue, Yamada and Smith discloses, teaches, or renders obvious that a wide range wave guide in a shape of a parallelepiped constituted by including a number of feeding ports is provided on a rear side of the heating chamber. The Office Action states that Carlson et al (US 5,352,873) shows a microwave oven with a multiple feeding ports having similar features. However, Carlson's oven comprises only one input means 7 (corresponding to the wave guide of the claim 6 invention) and two feed apertures 10, 10" (corresponding to the feeding port of the claim 6 invention) (Carlson; Figure 1). Also, they are not provided on a rear side of the heating chamber, but are arranged on the side wall of the oven (Carlson; Figure 1). Thus, Carson's oven is structurally completely different from the apparatus of claim 6. Therefore, the asserted combination of Nobue, Yamada, Smith and Carlson does not render claim 6 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 which are dependent from claim 6 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 6. In addition, regarding claim 10, none of Nobue, Yamada, Smith and Carlson discloses, teaches, or renders obvious the change in the size of feeding ports between at a vicinity of the high frequency generating portion and the remoter from the high frequency generating portion.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB 38893.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

April 16, 2008